EXHIBIT C

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS
2	DISTRICT OF PASSACHOSETTS
3	x
4	INTEGRATED COMMUNICATIONS & : TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al.,
5	: Civil Action No. Plaintiffs, 1:16-cv-10386-LTS
6	v.
7	: HEWLETT-PACKARD FINANCIAL SERVICES
8	COMPANY, et al.,
9	Defendants. :
10	x
11	
12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEO T. SOROKIN, DISTRICT JUDGE
13	VIDEO STATUS CONFERENCE
14	
15	Thursday, November 12, 2020
16	3:59 p.m.
17	
18	John J. Moakley United States Courthouse
19	One Courthouse Way Boston, Massachusetts
20	
21	
22	Rachel M. Lopez, CRR Official Court Reporter
23	One Courthouse Way, Suite 5209 Boston, Massachusetts 02210
24	raeufp@gmail.com
25	

```
APPEARANCES
1
 2
     On behalf of the Plaintiffs:
 3
          LAW OFFICE OF DIMITRY JOFFE
          BY: DIMITRY JOFFE
 4
          230 Park Avenue
 5
          10th Floor
          New York, New York 10169
          (212) 309-8711
 6
          dimitry@joffe.law
 7
          LAW OFFICE OF JOSH MCGUIRE
 8
          BY: JOSHUA A. MCGUIRE
          51 Winchester Street
 9
          Suite 205
          Newton, Massachusetts 02461
10
          (617) 461-6400
11
          josh@joshmcquirelaw.com
12
13
     On behalf of the Defendants:
14
          GIBBONS, P.C.
          BY: ANTHONY P. CALLAGHAN AND PAUL A. SASO
          One Pennsylvania Plaza
15
          37th Floor
          New York, New York 10119
16
          (212) 613-2015
          acallaghan@gibbonslaw.com
17
18
          CHOATE HALL & STEWART LLP
          BY: MICHAEL H. BUNIS, KEVIN C. QUIGLEY,
19
          AND G. MARK EDGARTON
          Two International Place
20
          100-150 International Place
          Boston, Massachusetts 02110
21
          (617) 248-4030
          mbunis@choate.com
22
          kquiqley@choate.com
23
          medgarton@choate.com
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS 1 (In open court.) 2 THE DEPUTY CLERK: The United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts is now in session, the 4 Honorable Leo T. Sorokin presiding. 5 Today is November 12th, the case of Integrated 7 Communication Technology, vs. Hewlett-Packard Financial Services Company, Civil Action 16-10386 will now appear 8 before this court. 9 Counsel, please identify themselves for the record. 10 11 MR. JOFFE: Dimitry Joffe of Joffe Law PC, for plaintiffs. 12 MR. BUNIS: Michael Bunis, Choate, Hall, and 13 Stewart on behalf of the defendants. 14 15 MR. MCGUIRE: Josh McGuire on behalf of plaintiffs. MR. BUNIS: I'm sorry, Josh. 16 MR. EDGARTON: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Mark 17 Edgarton, Choat, Hall, and Stewart on behalf of the 18 defendants. 19 MR. QUIGLEY: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Kevin 20 Quigley, Choate, on behalf of the defendants, as well. 21 MR. CALLAGHAN: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Anthony 22 23 Callaghan from Gibbons PC, also on behalf of defendant. MR. SASO: And good afternoon, Your Honor, Paul 24 Saso from Gibbons PC, on behalf of defendants. 25

```
THE COURT: Good afternoon. So first of all, thank
1
 2
     you to all of you for making yourselves available so quickly
 3
     in response to the short notice that I gave you of this
     hearing.
 4
               I have watched the video of the deposition that
 5
     Mr. Bunis provided and copied to all of you. This is why I
 6
     scheduled the hearing. I have one practical question first.
 7
               How many -- putting aside -- not including experts,
 8
     just the nonexpert depositions, how many depositions are left
 9
     for plaintiffs to take and how many are left for defendants?
10
11
               MR. JOFFE:
                           The plaintiffs are currently taking the
     deposition of Stewart Patterson, which is going on today.
12
13
     will have two -- well, a day and a half of 30(b)(6)
     depositions. I believe, Your Honor, that's all that's
14
     scheduled left for plaintiffs to take.
15
               THE COURT: So a day and a half of the 30(b)(6).
16
     Mr. Patterson -- this interrupts Mr. Patterson's deposition.
17
18
               MR. JOFFE: Right. And I think that's -- let me
19
     just make sure at my schedule here, but I believe that's it,
     Your Honor.
                  I have the schedule.
20
               THE COURT: And then what about -- and then there's
21
     Mr. O'Grady.
22
               MR. JOFFE: Well, Mr. O'Grady, we don't have a --
23
     we have one hour of Mr. O'Grady.
24
25
               THE COURT: I mean, do you want Mr. O'Grady's
```

deposition or not?

MR. JOFFE: We do, of course.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. JOFFE: And Your Honor, and one other, we have a Barclay deposition, Kevin Barclay, the day before Mr. O'Grady. And then that deposition, I believe Mr. Bunis instructed Mr. Barclay not to answer my questions on very many occasions that did not call for those instructions and we would like to move to upend those instructions and maybe have him for another half a day deposition.

THE COURT: You can -- I don't know anything about that, either way.

MR. JOFFE: Right.

THE COURT: But you can certainly file a motion saying that you want Mr. Barclay to come back because, and give me the transcript and explain to me what happened. And then I'll look at it and I'll give the defendants a chance to oppose that, and then I'll see.

And obviously, it goes without saying that if I think a witness didn't testify to things, in response to proper questions, that they should have testified about, then I'll probably order that they give — they answer those questions. I'm not saying that the questions were proper and I'm not saying that the instructions were improper, I'm simply saying that's a — but you have to bring it to me and

```
file a motion.
 1
               MR. JOFFE: Of course.
 2
 3
               With that in mind, then, we have 30(b)(6) for one
     and a half days, we have about five hours left with
 4
     Mr. Patterson and, tentatively, we have a few extra hours
 5
     with Mr. Barclay, then, and that's it.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: All right. So a day and a half
     30(b)(6), five hours Mr. Patterson. Mr. O'Grady, depending
 8
     on what happens with that. And then you -- at the moment,
 9
     the only other motion you'd have for more depositions --
10
               MR. JOFFE: Barclay.
11
               THE COURT: -- would be with respect to -- -- was
12
     it Barclay?
13
14
               MR. JOFFE: Yes, the witness is Kevin Barclay.
               THE COURT: And that would be, sounds like from
15
     what you're saying, if you won that, 30 minute to half a day?
16
               MR. JOFFE:
17
                           Yes.
               THE COURT: Okay. And then how many do the
18
     defendants have left to take?
19
               MR. SASO: Your Honor, there are five witnesses
20
     that have not yet completed their depositions.
21
                                                      They would
     include Jade Cheng, who we've only been able to get through
22
23
     about two hours with, so we expect two more days with
     Mr. Cheng, Caroline Cheng, Jason Yuyi, and Cathy Yu. And
24
     then, of course, we have the issue, as well, with Alexander
25
```

```
Pekar, and his subpoena. He has not -- that issue has to be
1
     resolved, as well, before taking his deposition.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: So if you had everybody, six deponents,
 4
     and --
 5
               MR. SASO: No, five deponents.
               THE COURT: And one of those are two-day
 6
 7
     depositions, some are one day.
               MR. SASO: Five witnesses, but, yes, some of them
 8
     will be more than one day.
 9
               THE COURT: Okay. Okay. All right. So let me --
10
11
               And do you have any update on the timing of a
     transcript of the O'Grady deposition?
12
13
               MR. BUNIS: I think we have it, Your Honor.
14
               MR. JOFFE: You mean O'Grady, the one that you have
     the video?
15
               THE COURT: Yes.
16
               MR. JOFFE: I think we have rough. Do we have
17
     rough, Michael?
18
               MR. BUNIS: I believe so. I believe so.
19
20
               MR. JOFFE: We have rough, yes.
                           So let me -- well, Mr. Bunis, you
21
               THE COURT:
     raised that you're unhappy with what transpired at the
22
23
     deposition. Were there specific things that you wanted -- I
     mean, I've watched it and I -- I don't have -- I have my own
24
     thoughts, but I don't have a specific -- I didn't know if
25
```

there were specific things you wanted in response to --

MR. BUNIS: Your Honor, I think I alluded to the fact that at the time -- I think I'm getting my days confused, Judge. When we were before you and that was the same day of the O'Grady deposition, I think I had mentioned to you that we hadn't had an opportunity to caucus amongst the defendants, clients, et cetera, to figure out what kind of relief we would be seeking as a result.

THE COURT: Yes, I understand.

MR. BUNIS: And we've still -- we've talked generally about it, but I don't think we've reached a conclusion.

I will say that my concerns that are articulated to you, in part, when we were together last are that the behavior of opposing counsel during the course of the deposition was improper, and I did not want to subject the witness to it. I think it was inappropriate and I don't want to subject further witnesses to it.

THE COURT: Okay. So then let me just tell you all some tentative thoughts.

I watched the entirety of the video. I think that, Mr. Joffe, that there was conduct -- my tentative view -- and I say tentative, because you haven't had the chance to address this in any great way. Mr. Bunis brought it up the day it happened. I didn't -- other than him telling me that

he thought there was various improper conduct, I didn't get into it with him. And you -- other than you telling me you've had a very different of it, which is fair, I didn't get into it with you. I wanted to watch the video.

This is a case in which I'm very familiar with the case, much more familiar than most cases, because there's been — it's been around for a long time, because it's been heavily litigated from the moment it was filed. So I'm quite familiar with the allegations and I'm quite familiar with all of you, because I've interacted with all of you at numerous hearings over the course of this case and I've read and resolved numerous motions.

So, but nonetheless -- so that is why I am inclined to give you a tentative view of what I think is a response to this, but it is only a tentative view and I am going to give you both the chance to respond in writing to what I'm laying out.

The short version is, I don't think your behavior, Mr. Joffe, was proper in the deposition. There were various things that you said in the deposition that I think were not proper and appropriate. The thought — as my tentative thought for a response to this is that the depositions should be supervised going forward and that they should be supervised at your expense. And the reason I think it — when I say "your expense," it's you or your plaintiffs, but

the reason I think it's your expense is because prior to Tuesday, it hadn't occurred to me that the depositions would need to be supervised by a third person, but after watching the deposition, I think that they do.

And I think that the reason that they need to be supervised is not because Mr. Bunis terminated the deposition, but because of what led to Mr. Bunis's decision to terminate the deposition. And so that's my tentative view, that they should be supervised and that they should be supervised at the expense of either you, Mr. Joffe, or plaintiffs. The reason my tentative view is for that, is that the reason for supervision is because of that conduct at the deposition and coming out of not — that deposition, in my view, doesn't stand alone in this case, and it comes out of a history of what I've observed in court and in the course of the case.

But that said, I think that you and your clients are entitled to weigh in on that and that's why I say it's only a tentative view. And so my thought is to give you the chance to weigh in on that. You can tell me why I -- I don't know if you want that or don't want that or any part of that. You tell me what -- tell me in writing -- I'm not expecting you to, like, conclusively respond right now. I'll give you an opportunity to tell me why I shouldn't do that, or I should do something else instead of, or something -- whatever

```
it is that you think -- you wish me to respond to that.
 1
 2
     Whatever way you wish to respond to that.
               And then the defendants, you can respond, as well,
 4
     if you wish, after Mr. Joffe responds.
 5
               MR. JOFFE: Your Honor, I'm prepared to respond
     right now, if you'll let me, please.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: And you don't wish to have an
     opportunity to respond --
 8
               MR. JOFFE: I would like to have an opportunity to
 9
     talk to the clients with respect to payments for this.
10
11
               THE COURT:
                          Okay.
               MR. JOFFE: But the matter of supervised
12
13
     depositions, I wholeheartedly welcome your suggestion.
               THE COURT: Okay.
14
               MR. JOFFE: I wanted to ask you for a supervised
15
     deposition, but since you offered it, I will talk to them
16
     about payment, but I think I'll convince them that that's the
17
18
     right thing to do.
19
               THE COURT: Okay.
               MR. JOFFE: And that was my intention, frankly, to
20
     ask you for supervised depositions and I -- I told opposing
21
     counsel, on one of those depositions, that I would like to
22
23
     ask the Court for supervised --
               THE COURT: All right. So let me tell you, then --
24
25
               MR. JOFFE: I will quickly consult with my clients
```

```
as to expense, but other than that -- and I think we will be
 1
 2
     able to --
               THE COURT: So let me tell you, then, what I was
 4
     thinking about. I was thinking that -- I was thinking that,
 5
     if they are supervised and if you agree, then that certainly
     simplifies the matter. The person that I had in mind was
 7
     Retired Chief Magistrate Judge Charles Swartwood.
               MR. JOFFE: Charles -- I'm sorry, Your Honor. I
 8
 9
     didn't get the name.
               THE COURT: Charles, last name is Swartwood,
10
11
     S-w-a-r-t-w-o-o-d. Swartwood. Judge Swartwood was the --
     was a magistrate judge on this court, in the Worcester
12
13
     division, for many years. I don't remember how many years.
14
     He's now -- he left -- when he retired, he went to JAMS, so
     he's at JAMS.
15
               MR. JOFFE: Okay, Your Honor, if I may, do you
16
     know, what is his rate? What does he charge?
17
18
               THE COURT: I don't.
                                     I have no idea.
19
               MR. JOFFE: Okay. So we should contact with him
     directly to figure out the rate?
20
               THE COURT: You could call JAMS to find out what
21
     his ordinary and customary rate is.
22
23
               MR. JOFFE: Okay. I only have this question about
     the rates and the charges, but you know, I don't know
24
     Mr. Swartwood, but I think a retired magistrate judge will do
25
```

just fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So my thought in watching it, whether -- so whether there should be additional, different, other, or not that consequence, I hear Mr. Joffe saying supervision is fine. Payment is a question. He'd like to find out how much it costs. My tentative view was plaintiff should pay, or Mr. Joffe.

So I don't know you, Mr. Bunis, are thinking about what you wish and so you can do that. And you can ponder this and think about whether you want this or don't want this, or you want something different.

MR. BUNIS: Your Honor -- I don't want to interrupt, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: No, there's nothing else.

MR. BUNIS: I -- again, we do need to talk to the client about it and figure it out, but I do want to raise an issue, something that Your Honor raised, and actually when I first brought the matter up when we were together last. And that is Your Honor's ruling with respect to a prior issue of attorney conduct during a deposition and the decision to revoke pro hac status. And as Your Honor said today, that you are giving a tentative ruling, not based on only the video, but based upon your familiarity with the entire case. And I would just like to say, Judge, that I did not end the deposition lightly. The decision to do that was because I

felt that there was --

THE COURT: I didn't think that anything,
Mr. Bunis, in the deposition that you did, that was anything
other than professional conduct, or a reasonable judgment.

MR. BUNIS: I appreciate that, but what I'm saying is I thought there was extreme behavior on the other side.

And when you consider other behavior by -- my reference to Mr. Joffe by name is not meant to call names. I'm simply referring to conduct, so please understand that I'm --

THE COURT: I do.

MR. BUNIS: I'm not meaning to -- but, for example, there's been repeated sort of ignoring of local rules, like failure to meet and confer, just blowing off, frankly, Judge, dates and deadlines that are important in this district. And I'll say another thing, Judge, which is there has been just complete disengagement on the part of local counsel here.

Mr. McGuire, again, I am not naming names, I'm just pointing out simple facts. For example, Mr. McGuire, notwithstanding that we have a busy deposition schedule, has not defended a single deposition at all. And yet another lawyer has been brought in, who I don't think has entered an appearance in this case and has defended depositions in this case, which I'm not sure is proper. Certainly we'd agree to it, because we want to get things moving and be efficient, et cetera.

But the simple fact is this is not the way pro hac

2

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

relationships are supposed to work in this district. And so while I appreciate that the remedy that your tentative ruling is offering deals with the immediate question of deposition and conduct. This is a broader thing going on, Judge, and I think we are certainly considering a motion to revoke the pro hac status. I can't tell you now, because I haven't spoken to the client, but I think --THE COURT: So let me say this. You are free to ask for whatever you want and I will entertain it. You should understand, Mr. Joffe, that I have never ordered a supervised -- well, that's not true. Once -- no, I've never ordered a regular deposition to be supervised by anybody, in all of the time that I've been a judge, and this stands out in that circumstance. The -- whether a larger or more -- there are -look, I'll just say a couple things about that, Mr. Bunis. One, you can -- I'm not saying -- I'm not foreclosing that possibility, in addition to this. I guess my perspective is this: One, when are the other depositions? Are there depositions scheduled tomorrow? MR. JOFFE: Well, Your Honor, one is scheduled for right after this. THE COURT: You're in the middle of Patterson? MR. JOFFE: Yes.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I guess my thought is that I would look THE COURT: to defendants on this. If you think that you can complete --Mr. Patterson is your witness? MR. BUNIS: He's a defense witness. THE COURT: He's a defense witness, yeah. MR. BUNIS: Correct. THE COURT: If you think you can complete the deposition of that, without supervision, then fine. MR. JOFFE: Your Honor, but we would like to have that deposition supervised. I want to have supervision of that deposition. THE COURT: If you want Judge Swartwood to watch it, you can call JAMS and you can hire Judge Swartwood today to be there as an observer. He wouldn't be my designee, but he would be an observer. You can do that, if you wish, but there's a videographer. MR. JOFFE: Well, I want to have it as you ordered, to have supervision, a court-appointed supervision, so on that authority --THE COURT: Well, you're not prepared to pay for it. You're not agreeing right now to my order that you would have to pay for it. MR. JOFFE: Right. But if we have it, I would like to have Patterson, the remainder five hours to be supervised, as well. Your Honor, if you ordered it, I think it's fair

for us to ask that Patterson be --1 THE COURT: I haven't -- just so we're clear, I 2 3 haven't ordered it yet. MR. JOFFE: Okay. THE COURT: But my thought would be, if I order it, 5 it's going to apply to all the depositions going forward. 6 7 MR. JOFFE: Okay. The -- with respect to the revoking pro 8 THE COURT: hac vice, you should know a couple things. One, I've been 9 very unhappy with you for a long time, Mr. Joffe, because of 10 repeated misconduct that I've enumerated in numerous orders. 11 And I have -- the focus, my focus, has been and remains on 12 13 the admonition in Rule 1 that -- to resolve cases on the 14 merits. And but you should understand that clients pick lawyers, and clients own their lawyers. And I'm -- I prefer 15 not to punish clients directly or indirectly for the 16 misconduct of their lawyers, but there is some inevitable 17 18 consequence of that. 19 So you should think about that. With respect to revoking the pro hac vice, you can 20 ask for that. I brought it up, because misconduct at a 21 deposition, especially in the context of this case, is the 22 23 kind of thing that, at least it came to my mind, and I thought I should raise it with you. 24 25 I will say that in the case that I revoked the pro-

hac vice of a lawyer, he -- if my recollection is accurate, both stood in front of me and lied to me, expressly, about a very specific fact or transaction, event in the deposition, and destroyed a piece of evidence with respect to that, which had to do with a note that he passed to a witness.

MR. JOFFE: Your Honor, Mr. Bunis just lied to you five minutes ago. He said that Josh McGuire did not defend a single deposition and Mr. McGuire defended the first witness. The first witness was defended by Mr. McGuire.

THE COURT: So Mr. Joffe, several things. One, I reminded you last time. There's a way in which court works. And the way in which court works is that I'm the judge, in case you forgot. And what that means is when I'm speaking, you don't interrupt me. When I'm finished, you will have an opportunity to make whatever points you make. In the course of this four and a half years, I've never prevented you at a hearing from making whatever statements or objections you wish to make and I'm not about to start now. So — but I specifically reminded you on Tuesday that don't interrupt. It is not —

MR. JOFFE: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: It is not only improper conduct of a lawyer, it is also rude. Yes, do you understand that?

MR. JOFFE: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So don't do it. All right?

MR. JOFFE: I'm sorry, Your Honor. 1 THE COURT: Second, there is -- you need to 2 3 understand, when you make a statement like that, that 4 Mr. Bunis lied, you need to understand what it means to be a lawyer. Okay? That is the kind statement that I ordinarily 5 hear from a pro se litigant. You should understand that it's -- there are three -- from my -- from what I've heard in 7 the course of this little Zoom about whether Mr. McGuire 8 9 defended a deposition or not, I heard a statement by Mr. Bunis, I believe what he said was that Mr. McGuire hadn't 10 11 defended a deposition. One question, then, would be whether that is factually correct. It may be possible -- I don't 12 13 know the answer -- that Mr. McGuire has defended a deposition. If that's so, that would suggest to me that 14 Mr. Bunis made a mistake. That is, he said something that 15 was not accurate, but you didn't say that what Mr. Bunis said 16 was inaccurate. You said what Mr. Bunis did was he, quote, 17 18 lied. 19 MR. JOFFE: Correct. THE COURT: That is a very, very serious accusation 20 to make about any person and most especially another lawyer. 21 So what basis, right now, you tell me, do you have, 22 23 in your possession to tell you that Mr. Bunis lied as opposed to made a mistake? 24 25 MR. JOFFE: That deposition happened about two

```
weeks ago, and Choate Hall, the lawyer of Mr. Bunis were
1
     present on that deposition. I don't recall if Mr. Bunis
 2
 3
     himself was present, but definitely lawyers from --
 4
               THE COURT: So in the last two weeks -- you've
     taken some depositions, you told me, at 3:00 a.m., yes?
 5
 6
               MR. JOFFE:
                          Well, yes.
               THE COURT: Yes or no?
 7
 8
               MR. JOFFE: Yes, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: And some at 5:00 a.m., yes?
 9
               MR. JOFFE: Yes, Your Honor.
10
11
               THE COURT: And it's been a busy time of taking
     depositions, yes?
12
13
               MR. JOFFE: Yes, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: And you don't know, as you sit here
     now, whether Mr. Bunis was actually personally present at the
15
     deposition that Mr. McGuire defended?
16
                           I don't recall. That's easy to find
17
               MR. JOFFE:
18
     out.
19
               THE COURT:
                          No, no. I'm asking you what you knew
     when you said he lied.
20
21
               MR. JOFFE:
                          Okay.
               THE COURT: Did you know then -- did you have
22
23
     personal knowledge then that Mr. Bunis was present?
               MR. JOFFE: No, Your Honor. I have a firm,
24
25
     personal memory that lawyers from Choate Hall were present.
```

```
THE COURT: Yes, but you didn't know if Mr. Bunis
 1
 2
     was present?
 3
               MR. JOFFE:
                           Yes, but he's the head of the team, so
 4
     he would know who deposed Mr. De Silva --
 5
               THE COURT: And you have no idea, whether, in the
     course of all the things that happened, other than the fact
 6
 7
     that Choate Hall defended it and he's head of the team at
     Choate Hall, and that, therefore, there was a reasonable
 8
 9
     inference that he would have been told --
               MR. JOFFE: And they received videos.
10
11
               THE COURT: You have no idea if whether what he did
     was made a mistake, or whether he lied?
12
13
               MR. JOFFE: Well, Your Honor, I think he lied.
     That's what I said.
14
               THE COURT: I understand you think he lied.
15
     not asking you what you thought. I'm asking you what is the
16
     factual basis for your belief that he lied?
17
18
               MR. JOFFE: I have a number of facts that I just
19
     stated to you that Choate Hall was a participant in that
20
     deposition, that they participated in the Zoom deposition,
     that they took transcripts and videos and rough transcripts
21
     of that deposition. That was the first plaintiffs' witness,
22
23
     deposed during the day, Marina da Silva, that was defended by
     Josh McGuire. It happened -- I will tell you exactly when --
24
25
               THE COURT: I don't need to know when it happened,
```

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Joffe, because that's not answering my question. That is telling me -- Mr. Joffe, that is telling me that there is reason to believe that Mr. Bunis would know he was present. That isn't telling me that he would -- that he lied. There's a difference. It doesn't mean when he's sitting here right now he remembered every person who was present. So what you're telling me is other than the fact that Choate Hall certainly knows who was there and he's head of the team, and at one point in time, he probably learned and you're representing to me that Mr. McGuire did defend that deposition, yes? MR. JOFFE: Yes. THE COURT: Then you have no other basis to know whether he lied, or he made a mistake when he said that. MR. JOFFE: Your Honor, the inferences from the facts that I know tells me that he deliberately made a false statement, or that he made that statement with reckless disregard for the truth, or he made that false statement with gross negligence for the truth. THE COURT: Would you like me to apply that standard to you, Mr. Joffe. MR. JOFFE: It's not necessarily his direct knowledge. He --THE COURT: Would you like me to apply that standard to you, Mr. Joffe?

MR. JOFFE: Yes, Your Honor, if I lied to you or 1 2 made false statements, yes. I --THE COURT: No, no. Would you like me to apply the standard that if you -- if I had reason to believe you know 4 things and say something different, that I should come to the 5 conclusion you lied to me? 6 7 MR. JOFFE: Yes, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: You want me to apply that standard to 9 you? MR. JOFFE: If I was grossly negligent and I made 10 11 false statements to you and if I was disregarding the truth deliberately or recklessly and making false statements to 12 13 you, you should accuse me in lying, yes. 14 THE COURT: And if I find that you were reckless and the recklessness is established by the fact that you had 15 knowledge of the underlying facts and you made a statement 16 different than what the underlying facts were. 17 18 MR. JOFFE: Yes, Your Honor. If I made a false 19 statement to you as Mr. Bunis just did and if I did it with 20 disregard for the truth, or negligent -- grossly negligent disregard for the truth, you should accuse me of lying. Yes. 21 Okay. I agree with that. 22 23 THE COURT: I appreciate that. Thank you. MR. JOFFE: If there is a false statement that I 24 25 made to the Court, let's start with that. There isn't and

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Michael Bunis just did and the question for you, Your Honor, is --

THE COURT: Mr. Joffe, I don't have time to go through all of your statements to the Court right now. I'm not going to do that. I think I have memorialized my views on the statement -- not all, but on many of the things you have said to the Court previously. Okay. And I'm not -- I appreciate your invitation to go over them, but I'm not going to, but if you'd like to start -- I'm not going to do it, but I would suggest you start with the docket and you start in January of -- I believe it was 2017, when you filed a motion for leave to amend the complaint and my order and then your response to that order, with the complaint you did file. Statements in the order on the motion for leave to file when I allowed the amended complaint, in part, and what I said to you then. That would be the beginning in this case, if we were reviewing statements by you, but we're not at the moment.

So turning back, Mr. Bunis, to what you said -MR. BUNIS: Judge, before you -- I apologize. I
first want to apologize to Mr. McGuire. I absolutely did not
know that he defended the deposition and I just would point
out one other thing. I don't believe that anyone from Choate
Hall and Stewart was present at all during that deposition,
at all. So forgive --

I apologize, Mr. McGuire. What I meant to say was, we've had a lot of deposition and I wasn't aware that he had defended anyway, but certainly no one from Choate Hall was present.

Sorry to interrupt, Judge.

THE COURT: That's all right, thank you. So what you're saying, Mr. Bunis, is that based on what information you've received while this conversation is occurring, there was a deposition, Mr. McGuire did defend the depositions, is your understanding, although you weren't there personally, but there was no lawyer from Choate Hall there at that deposition.

MR. BUNIS: That's what I understand, Your Honor, correct.

THE COURT: That's what you believe.

MR. BUNIS: Absolutely.

THE COURT: So for Mr. Joffe, I would just point out -- okay. I will just point out, Mr. Joffe, that I'm not about to have a hearing to determine whether or not, in fact, there was a Choate Hall lawyer present at that deposition, but if I determine that, in fact, there was no Choate Hall lawyer at that deposition, if I did what you told me to do, which was to apply your standard to statements, I would find that you just lied to me.

MR. JOFFE: No need, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And when you said that Choate Hall was at the deposition, because you told me Choate Hall was at the deposition. I'm not going to find that, because that standard is not the standard that applies, because my understanding is that people make mistakes and what I assume that was, when you told me that Choate Hall was there if, in fact, they weren't there, which I don't really care at the moment, I would think you made a mistake, not that you lied to me. Which is what I thought with respect to Mr. Bunis and I pointed it out to you, because when you make incendiary charges like "lying," they are very serious, and lawyers — and you are a lawyer — need to take — need to think about their words before they utter them and that is a charge that you need to take seriously.

So turning back to what we were talking about,
Mr. Bunis, which is you may — there is, in some ways,
certain differences and even if, on Mr. Joffe's standard, he
lied to me about whether or not Choate Hall was at the
deposition of that person that Mr. McGuire defended, lied on
his version of what constitutes lying, which is not my
version of what constitutes lying. I think at best he made a
mistake there, but I understand apparently Mr. Joffe is, at
least today, arguing for a different standard.

There's some potentially material differences between Mr. Ryan, who was that lawyer that I revoked, and

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm not saying that it's off the table. I'm not saying anything is off the table, but if you want that or anything else, you need to ask for it in a motion. -- and I'm not -- I'm open to the supervision and I'm confident that what I saw on the video would not occur for very long in front of Judge Swartwood and threats of criminal --I would also tell you, Mr. Joffe, do you practice criminal law? MR. JOFFE: I practice white collar defense, Your Honor. THE COURT: I think you should brush up on your Fifth Amendment law, would be my suggestion. I don't think your explication of the Fifth Amendment to Mr. O'Grady was an accurate statement of the law. MR. JOFFE: Well, Your Honor, if I may. If I may. THE COURT: No, not at the moment, because I don't think it's material. I'm just pointing that out. That is not -- what the Fifth Amendment is is not material -- how the Fifth Amendment would apply to Mr. O'Grady is not a material issue for today, or for the resolution of any response, but I simply point out to you that I don't believe that your assertion that if he testified at this civil deposition, he would have waived his Fifth Amendment right with respect to future criminal proceeding is accurate, but in any event.

So if you want something else, Mr. Bunis, you need

to ask for it in a motion. 1 2 With respect to the supervision of the deposition, 3 if you -- either of you object either, (a), to supervision, (b), having Judge Swartwood opposed as to anybody else being 4 the supervisor, or (c), having the plaintiffs pay for it, 5 then you should -- you don't have to tell me right now. You get a chance to think about it. But you need to tell me, and 7 I was thinking rather quickly, but, you know, I was thinking 8 about some time next week, but we could talk about that. And 9 if your view is -- my sense is that plaintiffs want that, but 10 they don't -- but they might not want to pay for it. 11 MR. JOFFE: I didn't say that, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: You said -- you're not agreeing to pay 13 14 for it right now? MR. JOFFE: I didn't say they don't. They don't 15 know about it. 16 THE COURT: Yes. They might not want to pay for it 17 and they might. They haven't agreed. 18 19 MR. JOFFE: I think they wouldn't want to pay for it. My strong assumption is they would. 20 THE COURT: You can tell me, Mr. Bunis, if you want 21 that, even under those terms, or you want something else in 22 23 addition, or separate. And I'm open --MR. JOFFE: One thought -- sorry, Michael. Go 24 ahead. 25

MR. BUNIS: One thought I had, judge, and again, this is happening in realtime, but I'm -- one consideration is the relationship between all of these various different things and, in particular, you know, if we are inclined to move for revocation of the pro hac, that -- and Your Honor grants that, that will necessarily -- or may, I should say, impact who takes the depositions that are remaining. And if the person who takes the depositions is a different person, then the need for supervision might not be necessary.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. BUNIS: I think it's possible that we could make the decision about the motion for revocation of pro hac quickly, and I think it's also possible that we could assemble the materials to get in front of you to do that, quickly.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this question. Do you want the depositions delayed until the resolution of whatever motion you make and whatever Mr. Joffe finds out about paying for it?

MR. BUNIS: Yeah. I mean, again, it's the client's call, but my inclination -- I don't want to -- the clients are on the line now, Judge, and they'll probably fire me if I don't make some call that they need to weigh in on, but my inclination is yes, but I obviously need to confirm with them.

MR. JOFFE: If Your Honor allows me to give a call to my clients, I can confirm that in five minutes, with respect to payment, because I'm sure they will agree to supervision.

THE COURT: You don't want to know how much Judge Swartwood charges?

MR. JOFFE: I just want to tell them that we're going to pay for -- I want to know his rate, that's what I ask for, and I just want to tell them --

THE COURT: I did not ask his rate.

MR. JOFFE: Right, but that's important for us, so I want to know the rate. I want to tell my clients, but in theory, I can assure you that, unless it's an exorbitant and unaffordable fees, we will agree to that. As a pro forma, I want to check the rate and tell my client this.

THE COURT: Well, what is exorbitant to one person is cheap to somebody else and I don't mean that facetiously, but you know, it just depends. I have no idea.

MR. JOFFE: That's okay. We'll figure it out and I will tell them, but that won't take me long. I mean, we 100 percent support supervision of my depositions. I mean, we don't need to supervise defendants taking depositions. We have no complaints about that. They don't need to be supervised and I don't think they need their depositions to be supervised, but my remaining defendants, witnesses.

```
THE COURT: If there were supervision, Mr. Bunis,
1
 2
     would you want -- do you feel it's only necessary for the
     ones that plaintiff takes, or all of them?
 3
               MR. JOFFE: Well, then they should pay for their
 4
     own depositions. Why should we pay for their depositions,
 5
     supervision, if we don't --
 6
               THE COURT: Well, first of all, you just said they
 7
     don't need to be supervised, so they --
8
 9
               MR. JOFFE: Well, they don't need --
               THE COURT: I'm just asking him what his opinion
10
11
     is, Mr. Joffe.
               MR. BUNIS: My view, Judge, is that the whole need
12
13
     for supervision is the result of the conduct of the
14
     plaintiffs' lawyer.
15
               THE COURT: I understand that, but suppose
     Mr. Joffe were in the case and there were supervision of what
16
     the depositions that plaintiff takes, would you also want the
17
18
     depositions that you take supervised, or do you feel that's
19
     unnecessary?
               MR. BUNIS: I think if he's going to participate in
20
     the depositions, they should be supervised, because it's his
21
     conduct that we're concerned about.
22
23
               THE COURT: Okay. So you feel that there were
     problems even in the ones you took?
24
25
               MR. BUNIS: I did not take those depositions.
```

Counsel --1 THE COURT: I mean, you, the defendants. 2 3 MR. BUNIS: Yeah, I would defer to Mr. Saso and I 4 think he would tell you yes, but he's on the line. 5 MR. SASO: Your Honor, yes, I think that if we were considering supervised depositions, I think that we have had 6 7 problems. Again, I -- just like Mr. Bunis, don't want to point fingers, but there have --9 THE COURT: You would want them all supervised. MR. SASO: But there would be a marked difference 10 11 that we've experienced between those that have been defended by Mr. Joffe and by other counsel, so I think that it would 12 13 depend upon the plaintiffs' counsel who would be defending 14 those depositions as to whether or not supervision would be 15 necessary. MR. JOFFE: And Your Honor, I don't mind 16 supervision of whatever I defend. I didn't defend many 17 18 depositions. Josh McGuire and Mr. Lester Reardon, if you remember the first local counsel. 19 THE COURT: I remember Mr. Reardon. 20 MR. JOFFE: They were mostly defending. I think I 21 defended two, yeah, and that's it. So I don't mind having 22 23 all supervisions -- all depositions supervised. I just think that, in all fairness, when I take deposition and have 24

supervisor, we should pay for it, but when defendants take

25

deposition, maybe for that time, maybe they can afford to pay.

THE COURT: So we're clear, the reason I'm thinking about ordering supervision, Mr. Joffe, is because of you.

MR. JOFFE: Right.

THE COURT: So if I ordered supervision, whatever supervision I ordered, I would order that it seems to me that I would be inclined to think the plaintiffs should pay for it, or you should pay for it, because it was because of you. The default is the depositions proceed without supervision that lawyers are able to manage the depositions themselves. Having watched the video and — standing alone and in context with this case, it came to my mind that supervision is required. If supervision is required, then I would — whatever level of supervision, whether it's just the ones you're involved in or all of them, then I would — my tentative view is the plaintiffs or you would have to pay for it.

And the question of fairness that you raise is —
if you all came to me at the beginning of the case and said,
Judge, we just think it would be a good idea to have somebody
supervise, I'd be like, well, that's fine. You can have
someone supervise it and you guys can split the cost and
figure it out yourselves. That would be much the way you
would figure out who's going to take the court reporting.

```
But this is court ordered, if it is, and we turn out to do
1
 2
     that, so that's why I would be inclined. But you can address
 3
     it.
               So it seems that you need a little bit of time,
 4
     each, to talk to your clients.
 5
               MR. BUNIS: Your Honor, I just heard from the
 6
 7
     client through the magic of -- I've just heard from the
     client, they've given me -- if Your Honor will order it, we
8
     will move for the revocation of the pro hac of Mr. Joffe, and
 9
     we would agree to putting off the continued depositions until
10
     that's resolved.
11
               THE COURT: Okay. So that's what you want to do?
12
               MR. BUNIS: That's right.
13
               THE COURT: All right. And realistically when --
14
               And from you, Mr. Joffe, you need, it sounds like,
15
     a day to figure out Mr. -- Judge Swartwood's rate and talk to
16
     your clients?
17
18
               MR. JOFFE: Yes, Your Honor, but it's really more
19
     like a pro forma. I cannot commit without talking to them
     about it.
20
               THE COURT: Right. I understand.
21
               MR. JOFFE: But I'm sure, I can give you my strong
22
     assurances that they will agree to that.
23
               So because it involves an expense, I make sure that
24
     I will check with them first.
25
```

Right. The prudent thing to do would THE COURT: 1 2 be to --3 MR. JOFFE: I will advise them to strongly agree to 4 that. And I have all reasons to believe that they will follow my advice. 5 THE COURT: So my suggestion, then, is this: 6 7 close of business tomorrow, Mr. Joffe, you file something that simply says you either -- the plaintiffs agree to 8 9 supervision, agree to supervision by Judge Swartwood and agree to pay for it, or they don't. And if they don't, you 10 11 just tell me they don't, and then my thought would be you could have a week -- but you tell me if that's reasonable --12 13 to tell me, if you don't agree, you know, which party you 14 don't agree and why. And if you do agree, I don't need 15 anymore from you. Okay? MR. JOFFE: Yeah. 16 THE COURT: And if for some reason you're having 17 trouble getting in touch with your clients and you need 18 19 another day --MR. JOFFE: No, that's -- no. I will get in touch 20 with them right away. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 23 And then, Mr. Bunis, you want to file a motion seeking revocation of pro hac vice. Realistically, about how 24 long to do that? 25

```
MR. BUNIS: I think we could do it in a week,
1
 2
     Judge.
 3
               THE COURT: Okay. So you'll file a motion for pro
     hac vice, whatever -- whatever you want, whether it's pro hac
 4
     vice or anything else by next Friday. And then, Mr. Joffe,
 5
     probably -- I would ordinarily want to resolve that in
     less -- would hope you could respond in less than two weeks,
 7
     but I think I'm inclined to give you the two weeks, because
8
     Thanksgiving would be the week -- you get it next Thursday or
 9
     Friday, and the following week is Thanksgiving.
10
               MR. JOFFE: Okay.
11
                           I don't really want to make -- it just
12
               THE COURT:
     seems a little unfair to make it due on Friday, the day after
13
14
     Thanksgiving.
               If they -- are you going to get it in next Thursday
15
     or next Friday, Mr. Bunis?
16
               MR. BUNIS: I think we -- I think we -- we'd like
17
     the Friday, Judge.
18
19
               THE COURT: Right. Okay. So just thinking about
     this, Mr. Joffe, would you be able -- would you want the two
20
     weeks, or do you think you could respond by a week and a
21
     half, the Wednesday after Thanksgiving.
22
23
               MR. JOFFE: I can respond after -- a week after
     they file.
24
25
               THE COURT: One week?
```

MR. JOFFE: Yes. 1 THE COURT: That will be the Friday, the day after 2 3 Thanksgiving. MR. JOFFE: Well -- well, that's okay. I want this 4 to move forward and we're now breaking for like two, three 5 weeks, and there's four depositions. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. So you file that motion by next Friday, Mr. Bunis. 8 The following Friday, the day after Thanksgiving, 9 Mr. Joffe, you will respond -- you file your opposition. 10 11 If you wish to file a reply, Mr. Bunis, you can, without filing a motion, by Tuesday or Wednesday, Mr. Bunis? 12 13 MR. BUNIS: Wednesday, Judge. Wednesday. Okay. All right. I think 14 THE COURT: that -- and in your motion, in addition to addressing 15 whatever you want in your motion, you should address either 16 whether you want -- what your view is -- sort of your -- to 17 18 the extent you have a -- I understand if your position would 19 be -- if Mr. Joffe is gone from the case, your view is you don't think supervision is necessary. But if there's 20 anything else you wish to say about the supervision issue, 21 you could say it in there and that would give Mr. Joffe the 22 23 chance to respond to it when he responds. MR. JOFFE: Your Honor, and maybe I just comment on 24 this last. I think the plaintiffs' position would be that 25

```
whether I am in the case or not in the case, they would like
1
 2
     to have supervision.
               THE COURT: Okay. You can clarify that in the
 4
     filing tomorrow. You'll tell me about that. So it's just
     all I need to know -- it sounds like, from what you say, what
 5
     you anticipate saying is that the plaintiffs agree to
     supervision and they agree to pay for it, and they agree to
 7
     Judge Swartwood, there isn't -- it isn't like somebody knows
 8
     Judge Swartwood or anything like that.
 9
               MR. JOFFE: Regardless of who takes them from
10
11
     plaintiffs' side.
               THE COURT: Regardless of who takes them.
12
13
               MR. JOFFE:
                          Yes.
14
               THE COURT: Okay. Fine.
               And then you can respond to that, Mr. Bunis, in the
15
     filing next Friday, to the extent you wish.
16
               I think in the meantime the -- other than
17
     Mr. Patterson, I think you should wait on depositions. And
18
19
     if -- as to Mr. Patterson, I guess the question is do you
     want to wait on it, or that's the one you're in the middle
20
     of.
21
               MR. JOFFE: If you're asking me, Your Honor, I
22
23
     would love to wait.
               THE COURT: I'm asking both of you.
24
               MR. JOFFE: Oh, okay. I would love to suspend it
25
```

```
until we have, well, either supervision or --
 1
               THE COURT: Until we resolve these issues.
 2
 3
               MR. JOFFE: Yes, I don't want to continue with him,
     if we could have a chance to do that supervised.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Do you agree with that, Mr. Bunis?
               MR. BUNIS: Yes. Yes, Your Honor, we agree.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Fine. So the depositions
     are on hold, pending the resolution of this issue. You get
 8
     the filing tomorrow and next Friday.
 9
               MR. JOFFE:
                           Yes.
10
               THE COURT: Now, there was one other -- oh, I
11
     have --
12
13
               Is there anything else you wish to bring up,
     Mr. Joffe?
14
               MR. JOFFE: Yes, Your Honor. I think we have the
15
16
     hearing yesterday, or maybe I'm just -- the day before, and
     we established a lot -- lots of deadlines for this continuing
17
18
     deposition process and beyond. So do we push those deadlines
19
     until after the resolution? Because they don't make sense to
     follow if we're suspending.
20
               THE COURT: I think what I'd like -- if I remember
21
     right, the deadlines we set was one deadline of filing by
22
23
     next Friday of the depositions that remain to be done.
               MR. JOFFE: You know, frankly, I don't remember.
24
25
               THE COURT: Maria, do you have a list right there?
```

```
MR. JOFFE: I have it somewhere.
 1
               THE COURT: I think Maria has it.
 2
               MR. JOFFE: I think we have several deadlines.
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Hold on. I'm just looking at my
 4
             I just haven't done the notes yet.
 5
               MR. JOFFE: We have status report by Tuesday.
 7
     have my actual letter submission, I think, within two weeks.
               THE COURT: Your letter submission about what?
 8
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: By next Tuesday, Mr. Joffe, is
 9
     to submit, as to the service of --
10
11
               THE COURT: Oh, so you need to respond about
     Mr. Pekar by Tuesday, because we still need to resolve that.
12
13
               MR. JOFFE: Yeah, I will --
14
               THE COURT: So that remains, the deadline of
     Mr. Pekar.
15
               What's the next one, Maria?
16
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: And they were supposed to work
17
     out the schedule by next Friday as to all the depos and
18
19
     whether or not they were authorized.
20
               THE COURT: So all you need to do for that is just,
     by next Friday, give me the list -- just file a list of who's
21
     left to do and that will be helpful to know. You sort of
22
23
     reported it today, but who's left and like are they one day,
     two days, whatever they are.
24
               And what else?
25
```

```
THE DEPUTY CLERK: And then they have to file a
 1
     joint status report as to what's agreed on regarding each of
 2
     the five by January 11th.
               MR. JOFFE: There is also December 23rd date, I
 4
 5
     see.
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: December 23rd, notify them, each
     of them, as to whom they plan to examine and --
 7
               THE COURT: So for now, those deadlines stand, the
 8
     December 23rd and January deadlines, because those relate to
 9
     the examinations of the five.
10
11
               MR. JOFFE: Okay.
               THE COURT: And if they need to be adjusted after
12
13
     the depositions, we can adjust them at a later time.
14
               MR. JOFFE: Okay. Your Honor, so just to be clear,
     how we proceed with this -- we don't do anything about
15
     supervision. So you don't except me, then, to go back to you
16
     with my response until --
17
18
               THE COURT: I expect you tomorrow to tell me -- it
19
     could be a one-page filing -- that, like, your clients do or
20
     do not agree --
               MR. JOFFE: Okay. I understand. Confirmation from
21
     clients. Okay.
22
                      Tomorrow.
23
               THE COURT: Right.
               MR. JOFFE:
24
                          Yup.
25
               THE COURT: I think that the question you raised,
```

```
Mr. Joffe, about directions not to answer questions in the
 1
     Barclay deposition, we should resolve, first, these issues.
 2
 3
     Or do you want to raise those issues? You could raise them
 4
     now. You could file a motion by next Friday.
               MR. JOFFE: Well, I would rather do it by motion,
 5
     Your Honor.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: Yes, that's what I mean, by motion.
               MR. JOFFE: I need to quote portions of
 8
     transcripts, so of course I want to file a motion. It's
 9
     just --
10
11
               THE COURT: Yes, that's what I'm saying. So how
     about by next Friday?
12
13
               MR. JOFFE: -- for next Friday? Yes. That will
14
     do.
               THE COURT: And your motion is essentially what
15
     you're saying is that there were directions not to answer
16
     questions that you think the witness should have answered.
17
18
               MR. JOFFE: Absolutely, Your Honor. And next
19
     Friday will be, then, the 20th? So Friday, the 20th.
               THE COURT:
20
                           Yes.
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: I'm sorry, Judge, what is he
21
     filing by the 20th?
22
23
               MR. JOFFE: I'm filing a motion to overturn
     Mr. Bunis's instructions to the witness not to answer my
24
25
     questions.
```

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Thank you. 1 MR. JOFFE: And if that motion succeeds, then as a 2 3 remedy, I will ask additional deposition time of those witnesses who have been so improperly instructed. 4 5 THE COURT: All right. I think two weeks for that, Mr. Bunis? 6 7 MR. BUNIS: I do, too. THE COURT: Okay. Anything else from you, 8 9 Mr. Joffe? MR. JOFFE: No, Your Honor. No. I think 10 11 everything is understood. Next Tuesday I'm telling you about Pekar. And Your Honor, I contacted -- well, I attempted to 12 13 contact him after our hearing on Tuesday. I told him your 14 instructions. I need to tell him whether I accept subpoena on his behalf or not. I have not heard back from him. My 15 communication with him was one way, when he calls me. 16 will -- I hope he will, you know, reach out and let me know 17 18 by Tuesday, pretty much. 19 THE COURT: Okay. MR. JOFFE: So -- but other than that, I understand 20 we're suspending Patterson for today and we're pushing all 21 the other depositions. 22 THE COURT: Right. 23 MR. JOFFE: My client is on transit to Macao. They 24 booked the tickets, booked the hotel, and they're there for 25

depositions. They will be there on Friday, tomorrow. And they will stay there for a few days, until their medical — they have like five days before they should leave. So perhaps for them, Your Honor, and just because of expense, perhaps their depositions could be taken while they're there, because it's just — the tickets are nonrefundable, the hotel booking is nonrefundable. They are actually on the way there already.

THE COURT: I want to think about that after I see

THE COURT: I want to think about that after I see your filing tomorrow, but I remind you that they brought the case.

MR. JOFFE: I know and they're there for depositions. I'm just saying that they could be deposed.

I'm not going to defend them. Okay? Mr. Reardon will defend them, so the other side should have no objections to taking their depositions. They're there. They spent money, you know, they --

THE COURT: So Mr. Bunis, after you see the filing from Mr. Joffe tomorrow, if it is Mr. Reardon, you can let me know and just either you want those to go forward on a time agreed upon between you, Mr. Reardon, while they're in Macao, or you wish them to be suspended for resolution of all these issues.

MR. BUNIS: Thank you.

MR. JOFFE: And Your Honor, we proposed the dates

```
for November 13th and we proposed --
1
               THE COURT: Well, it's not going to be November
 2
 3
     13th, because I haven't got the notice yet from you about the
     supervision, but you can both let me know that tomorrow,
 4
     probably. And then I can respond to it pretty quickly and
 5
     then you can figure that out while they're still in Macao, if
     they go forward.
 7
 8
               All right. Is there anything else from you,
     Mr. Bunis?
 9
               MR. BUNIS: No, sir.
10
11
               THE COURT: I have one other question for you,
     Mr. Joffe.
12
13
               MR. JOFFE: Yes, Your Honor?
14
               THE COURT: I told me -- you told me the calvary,
     whoever that is, is coming.
15
               MR. JOFFE: Yes, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Are they coming, and if so --
17
               MR. JOFFE: Yes, Your Honor. They're coming down
18
19
     the hills as we speak.
               THE COURT: I see, and who is it who's coming?
20
     you can say, or when are they -- I quess my question is, this
21
     calvary, will they be filing notices of appearance in the
22
23
     case?
               MR. JOFFE: Absolutely, Your Honor.
24
25
               THE COURT: And when do you anticipate that will
```

```
occur?
 1
               MR. JOFFE: Any day now.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Because I think you filed something in
 4
     August --
 5
               MR. JOFFE: Yes, I brought it up at the end of
     August. It took a long process to accomplish and when you
 6
 7
     see the calvary, you'll understand why, but they're almost
     there. I'm just holding the fort.
 9
               THE COURT: I see. Okay. All right. Well, thank
     you all very much. I'll wait for the filings. You have a
10
11
     good day.
               MR. JOFFE: And I would be happy to reveal the
12
13
     names, I'm just not at liberty yet.
14
               THE COURT: Are they going to be appearing before
15
     the end of the year?
               MR. JOFFE: They will be appearing, I understand, a
16
     week or two maximum.
17
18
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Have a
19
     good day.
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: This matter is adjourned.
20
                (Court in recess at 4:56 p.m.)
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER I, Rachel M. Lopez, Certified Realtime Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code, the foregoing pages are a true and correct transcript of the stenographically reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Dated this 17th day of November, 2020. /s/ RACHEL M. LOPEZ Rachel M. Lopez, CRR Official Court Reporter